

**REMARKS:**

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-24. Claims 1, 15, 19, 23 and 24 are amended herein. Proper support for the amendments are found at least at pages 14-18 and FIGS. 6 and 7. No new matter is presented. Thus, claims 1-24 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):**

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,935,210 (Stark) and U.S. Patent No. 6,011,537 (Slotznick).

According to Stark, a resource map (300) provides a graphical representation of a hyperlink structure of a particular site described using an HTML format and meta-data characterizing each resource provided in the site (see, col. 4, line 66 through col. 5, line 8). In Stark, the resource map (300) includes branch nodes extending from and hierarchically subordinate to a root node, where each branch node represents hyperlinks embedded in the root resource of the site (see, col. 5, lines 8-17 and FIGS. 2 and 3). That is, Stark is directed to extracting links to resources described in an HTML format and storing information of the links and meta-data that characterizes the resources.

The Examiner acknowledges that Stark does not disclose analyzing and loading a file downloaded onto an invisible screen and executing the file without downloading the file when the file is designated on a display screen, but relies on Slotznick as teaching the same. Slotznick is directed to maintaining a secondary data in memory without displaying the secondary data while a user is viewing a primarily data, and downloading the secondary data when receiving an instruction from a user (see, col. 9, lines 22-39 and col. 20, lines 58-64). For example, while a web page described using an HTML format (primary data) that includes an image (secondary data) is viewed by a user, the image from the HTML web page is automatically downloaded to a memory and later displayed if the user requests display of the image (see, FIGS. 4, 5, and corresponding text).

In contrast, according to the present invention, when a source page is read using a network browser, a link-to page directly described partially or fully in a script file included in the source page and described to perform a predetermined processing for a text content described in a visible object or a program in the visible object is specified. Further, when a designation of link-to page is generated by analyzing content of the source page, the generated link-to page is

specified. For example, in the case where a new URL is generated by execution of a script, the present invention enables download of a resource based on the URL obtained by analyzing the script. Accordingly, the network browser of the present invention uses text described in an HTML format and text described in a script so that a URL of a link-to page is extracted, temporarily stored as a buffer, and downloaded from a server based on a predetermined condition to be retained in an invisible screen.

Independent claims 1, 15 and 19 as amended recite, “analyzing a display control file... to extract another file described or created by a script or program”, “specifying said another file to temporarily store a URL created by said script or said program” and “downloading from a server said another file based on said URL according to a predetermined condition”.

Stark and Slotznick, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest analyzing and extracting a file “described or created by a script or program” and “downloading from a server said file based on said URL according to a predetermined condition” for displaying the file “without downloading” the file, as recited in each of claims 1, 15 and 19.

It is submitted that the independent claims 1, 15 and 19 are patentable over Stark and Slotznick.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from independent claims 1, 15 and 19 are patentably distinguishable over the combination of Stark and Slotznick. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 4, “said analysis module accesses the server on the basis of each of the file names stacked in the analysis target list, and stacks each file name in the non-analysis-target list after the corresponding file has been downloaded”.

The Stark and Slotznick method does not teach or suggest an analysis module that “accesses the server on the basis of each of the file names stacked in the analysis target list, and stacks each file name in the non-analysis-target list after the corresponding file has been downloaded”, as recited in claim 4.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a):**

Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Slotznick and U.S. Patent No. 6,591,288 (Edwards).

Edwards is directed to providing accelerated access to the Internet or Intranet via a wireless telecommunications network. In Edwards, a server scans and downloads a web page and associated graphics that are linked to the web page that is currently being viewed by a user, into a cache (see, col. 5, lines 26-35). Then, when the user requests a linked Internet page from the displayed HTML page, it is transmitted from the cache by the server to the user's unit (see, col. 5, lines 35-40 and FIG. 3 and corresponding text).

The Examiner relies on Slotznick as teaching creating a screen image of the downloaded file and loading the same onto an invisible screen and displaying onto the display screen when the file is designated on the display screen. However, Slotznick is limited to extracting and storing a source page described in an HTML format (see, FIGS. 4, 5, and corresponding text).

Independent claims 23 and 24 as amended recite downloading a file "described or created by a script or a program from a server" when a resource file with which the file is linked is being browsed on a display screen, where the file is "downloaded based on a predetermined condition and a stored URL created by said script or said program". Further, the present invention includes "creating a screen image of the file onto an invisible screen" such that "the created screen image of the file loaded onto the invisible screen is displayed onto the display screen when the file is designated on the display screen", as recited in claims 23 and 24.

The combination of Slotznick and Edwards does not teach or suggest, "downloading a file described or created by a script or a program..., the file being downloaded based on a predetermined condition and a stored URL created by said script or said program" such that "the created screen image of the file loaded onto the invisible screen is displayed onto the display screen when the file is designated on the display screen", as recited in independent claims 23 and 24.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

Accordingly, claims 1, 15, 19, 23 and 24 are amended herein. Thus, claims 1-24 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 7-25-05

By: 

John C. Garvey  
Registration No. 28,607

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501